Casse3::111-cv-01368-JSW Document24 Filed 06/02/11 Page 11co f76

]
NGS
T TO 28
TED AL
011
1

Casse 3::111-cv-01368-JSW Document 23 Filed 06/02/11 Page 2206 f76

1		WHEREAS, on March 22, 2011, Defendant Euromarket Designs, Inc. d/b/a	
2	Crate & Bar	rel ("Crate & Barrel") removed a Complaint filed against it by Plaintiff Carlos	
3	Campbell ("	Plaintiff") to this Court in the above-captioned case, Campbell v. Crate &	
4	Barrel, Case	No. 3:11-cv-01368-JSW (N.D. Cal.) ("Campbell");	
5			
6		WHEREAS, the following five related cases have also been filed against	
7	Crate & Barrel:		
8			
9	1.	Dardarian v. Crate & Barrel, Case No. 3:11-cv-00945-JSW (N.D. Cal.)	
10		("Dardarian")	
11			
12	2.	O'Connor v. Crate & Barrel, Case No. 3:11-cv-02140-SC (N.D. Cal.)	
13		("O'Connor")	
14			
15	3.	Salmonson v. Crate & Barrel, Case No. 2:11-cv-02446-PSG -PLA (C.D.	
16		Cal.) ("Salmonson")	
17	4	Hoon to Coate & Raynel Cose No. 2:11 ov 00760 H.S. DCS (S.D. Col.)	
18 19	4.	Heon v. Crate & Barrel, Case No. 3:11-cv-00769-JLS -BGS (S.D. Cal.) ("Heon")	
20		(Heon)	
21	5.	Shughrou v. Crate & Barrel, Case No. 4:11-cv-02325-LB (N.D. Cal.)	
22		("Shughrou");	
23			
24		WHEREAS, plaintiffs in all six of these actions purport to represent a class	
25	of California	consumers and allege that Crate & Barrel unlawfully requested and recorded	
26	personal ide	ntification information from customers who purchased goods using credit	
27	cards at Crat	e & Barrel's retail establishments;	

28

Casse 3::111-cv-01368-JSW Document 24 Filed 06/02/11 Page 33:06f6

1	WHEREAS, plaintiffs in all six actions allege that this practice violates
2	California Civil Code § 1747.08 (the "Song-Beverly Credit Card Act" or "Act");
3	
4	WHEREAS, all six actions will require a court to resolve nearly identical
5	factual issues relating to a single common defendant, Crate & Barrel;
6	
7	WHEREAS, the parties agree that centralization of all six actions for
8	coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1407, because
9	they share common factual questions, and also because centralization would be convenient
10	and would promote the just and efficient conduct of pretrial proceedings;
11	
12	WHEREAS, on May 11, 2011, before the United States Judicial Panel on
13	Multidistrict Litigation ("JPML"), Crate & Barrel filed a Motion to Transfer Heon,
14	Dardarian, O'Connor, Campbell and Salmonson for coordinated or consolidated pretrial
15	proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;
16	
17	WHEREAS, on May 31, 2011, Crate & Barrel filed a Notice of Tag-Along
18	Action before the JPML seeking to centralize <i>Shughrou</i> together with the actions already
19	encompassed by its Motion to Transfer;
20	
21	WHEREAS, all six actions are likely to be centralized because they share
22	common factual questions, and also because centralization would be convenient and would
23	promote the just and efficient conduct of pretrial proceedings. See, e.g., In re Payless
24	Shoesource, Inc., California Song-Beverly Credit Card Act Litig., 609 F. Supp. 2d 1372
25	(J.P.M.L. 2009) (centralizing two putative class actions alleging identical violations of the
26	Song-Beverly Credit Card Act).
27	
28	

Casse 3::111-cv-01368-JSW Document 24 Filed 06/02/11 Page 44cf 76

1	WHEREAS, conducting pretrial proceedings while Crate & Barrel's Motion
2	to Transfer is pending would impose an undue burden on the parties and the Court if the
3	JPML ultimately grants Crate & Barrel's Motion to Transfer, because any pretrial
4	proceedings conducted now would likely be wasted or need to be repeated;
5	
6	WHEREAS, neither party will suffer any prejudice, hardship or inequity if
7	these proceedings are stayed pending the JPML's decision on Crate & Barrel's Motion to
8	Transfer;
9	
10	WHEREAS, the Court has the inherent power to stay all proceedings
11	pending the JPML's decision on Crate & Barrel's Motion to Transfer;
12	
13	WHEREAS, staying all proceedings pending the JPML's decision on Crate
14	& Barrel's Motion to Transfer would serve the interests of judicial economy and
15	efficiency, for all the reasons discussed above;
16	
17	WHEREAS, on June 1, 2011, the parties in <i>Dardarian</i> filed a substantially
18	similar Stipulation and Proposed Order Staying Proceedings pending the JPML's decision
19	on Crate & Barrel's Motion to Transfer;
20	
21	WHEREAS, on June 2, 2011, the parties in O'Connor filed a substantially
22	similar Stipulation and Proposed Order Staying Proceedings pending the JPML's decision
23	on Crate & Barrel's Motion to Transfer;
24	
25	WHEREAS, courts routinely stay all proceedings pending the JPML's
26	determination of a motion to transfer based on the likelihood of transfer, the absence of
27	prejudice, and the interests of judicial economy and efficiency. See, e.g., Clark v. Payless
28	Shoesource, Inc., Case No. 08-CV-08213 (C.D. Cal. Order filed Dec. 29, 2008) (entering

Casse3::11-cv-01368-JSW Document24 Filed 06/02/11 Page550f76

1	stipulated order staying all proceedings in a putative class action alleging violations of the
2	Song-Beverly Credit Card Act); Oregon ex rel. Kroger v. Johnson & Johnson, Case No.
3	11-CV-86-AC, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39187 (D. Or., Apr. 8, 2011) (granting motion to
4	stay pending JPML decision on motion to transfer); Barnes v. Equinox Group, Inc., Case
5	No. C 10-03586, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 138863 (N.D. Cal., Dec. 30, 2010) (same);
6	Cottle-Banks v. Cox Communications, Inc., Case No. 10-cv-2133, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
7	138195 (S.D. Cal., Dec. 30, 2010) (same); Gordillo v. Bank of Am., Case No. 1:09-cv-
8	01954, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7954 (E.D. Cal., Jan. 13, 2010) (same); Sanborn v.
9	Asbestos Corp., Ltd., Case No. C 08-5260, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7528 (N.D. Cal., Jan.
10	27, 2009) (same); Lyman v. Asbestos Defendants (B*P), Case No. C 07-4240, 2007 U.S.
11	Dist. LEXIS 78766 (N.D. Cal., Oct. 10, 2007) (same); Nielsen v. Merck and Co., Case No.
12	C 07-00076, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21250 (N.D. Cal., Mar. 15, 2007) (same); <i>Collum v</i> .
13	Astrazenca Pharm., L.P., Case No. C 06-0662, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 64861 (N.D. Cal.,
14	Aug. 29, 2006) (same); Rivers v. The Walt Disney Co., 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1362 (C.D. Cal.
15	1997) (granting motion to stay pending JPML decision on motion to transfer, holding:
16	"[I]t appears that a majority of courts have concluded that it is often appropriate to stay
17	preliminary pretrial proceedings while a motion to transfer and consolidate is pending with
18	the MDL Panel because of the judicial resources that are conserved.");
19	
20	NOW THEREFORE, it is stipulated by the undersigned counsel on behalf of
21	the parties below, and subject to the Court's approval, that:
22	
23	All proceedings in this action are stayed pending the JPML's decision on
24	Crate & Barrel's Motion to Transfer Cases for Consolidated or Coordinated Pretrial
25	Proceedings (MDL No. 2260).
26	
77	

W02-WEST:1LDC2\403609232.1 Case No. 3:11-cv-01368-JSW

28

Casse 3::111-cv-01368-JSW Document 23 Filed 06/02/11 Page 660 676

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
2	
3	Dated: June 2, 2011
4	HARRISON PATTERSON & O'CONNOR LLP
5	
6	By s/James R. Patterson
7	JAMES R. PATTERSON
	MATTHEW J. O'CONNOR
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff
9	CARLOS CAMPBELL Detect: June 2, 2011
10	Dated: June 2, 2011
11	SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
12	
13	By s/Elizabeth S. Berman
	P. CRAIG CARDON
14	DAVID R. GARCIA BRIAN R. BLACKMAN
15	ELIZABETH S. BERMAN
16	
₁₇	Attorneys for Defendant EUROMARKET DESIGNS, INC.
	d/b/a CRATE & BARREL
18	
19	
20	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.
21	
22	Dated: June 3 , 2011 Leffrey SWhite
23	Jeffrey S. White
24	United States District Judge
25	Northern District of California
26	
27	
28	